

From: [Michael Stephenson](#)
To: [Jump, Christine](#)
Subject: RE: Wichita CMS Activities
Date: Monday, December 08, 2014 3:42:46 PM

Tomorrow works great for me Chris.

The issue I am trying to solve is that the permit specifies the process by which we will select a final remedy, and does not reflect the lean process, so following the permit and following the lean process seem to be at odds with each other somewhat.

For example, the permit requires the following.

1. CMS Work Plan
2. CMS Work plan implementation
3. CMS Report
4. CMS Selection
5. CMS Implementation Work Plan
6. CMS Implementation
7. CMS Construction Completion Report

There are other reporting requirements (annual and 5-year intervals) that will likely not apply to next year but rather will kick in once the final remedy has been selected and is in place.

You had mentioned that using the lean process we may be able to forgo the CMS work plan step, so I am wondering what others we may be able to lean out. It's possible that we can't make that determination at this time since we need all of the information for the current work to do so, but I was hoping that the CMS process would not require two work plans and a minimum of two reports to navigate.

In any case, shall I call you around 3-4 PM your time to discuss tomorrow?

Mike

From: Jump, Christine [mailto:Jump.Chris@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 1:16 PM
To: Michael Stephenson
Subject: RE: Wichita CMS Activities

Mike-

Attached is a draft guide and agenda developed for the Lean remedy selection process. These have not gone through the final review process and may change in the future, but this gives you an idea of the types of discussion and decisions that will take place during the lean Remedy Selection Process.

I have not had a chance to review the permit yet, but we will need to make sure that we don't

contradict anything in the permit. I anticipate that the permit will be modified when we select a final remedy for the site, but until then we need to make sure we follow the permit. I will try to take a quick look at it tomorrow. We could potentially talk tomorrow late afternoon.

Chris Jump, L.G.
Waste Remediation and Permitting Branch
US EPA, Region 7
jump.chris@epa.gov
(913) 551-7141

Mailing address: 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, KS 66219

From: Michael Stephenson [<mailto:mstephenson@cameron-cole.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 1:08 PM
To: Jump, Christine
Subject: Wichita CMS Activities

Hi Chris,

I am in the process of putting together the scope of work for Wichita next year and am reviewing the permit to identify all of the requirements.

There are numerous components to the CMS process identified in the permit, and I know you and I have discussed the possibility of applying a streamlined CMS process to the site in light of the IRM work this year. Requirements III.I to III.M-3 pertain to the CMS process and I'd like to discuss with you what the streamlined process may look like so I can appropriately plan for these activities next year.

Do you have any materials from the various meetings that you could share with me or perhaps we could have a call to discuss what the scope of work would need to include? I'm available all week for a call, but would like to have this ironed out to the extent possible by Wednesday or so. Please let me know if you have some free time to discuss this issue.

Thanks,

Mike Stephenson
Principal Scientist
Cameron-Cole, LLC
50 Hegenberger Loop
Oakland CA 94621
office - 510.777.1864
mobile - 510.773.9895
mstephenson@cameron-cole.com